

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY**

---

**IN RE: PROTON-PUMP INHIBITOR PRODUCTS  
LIABILITY LITIGATION**

**2:17-MD-2789 (CCC)(LDW)  
(MDL 2789)**

**This Document Relates to:  
All cases listed in Exhibit A**

---

**OPINION AND ORDER**

**CECCHI, District Judge.**

**I. Introduction**

This matter comes before the Court upon Case Management Order (“CMO”) No. 60, ECF No. 709, entered on November 19, 2021, which identified 962 cases in which Pfizer, Inc.<sup>1</sup> (“Pfizer”) alleged that service of the summons and complaint had not been effected and in which no proof of service appeared on the docket of the case. CMO No. 60 ordered the plaintiffs in those cases within thirty days to (1) establish that service was effected on Pfizer as required by Rule 4(m) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure<sup>2</sup> by filing proof of service, (2) voluntarily dismiss Pfizer, or (3) show cause why Pfizer should not be dismissed within thirty days of entry of the Order. CMO No. 60, at 2, ECF No. 709. CMO No. 60 ordered Plaintiffs to file their responses on the dockets of the individual cases, and permitted Pfizer to oppose within thirty days of each plaintiff’s response.<sup>3</sup> Plaintiffs were specifically advised that “[f]ailure to comply with the terms of this Order will result in the dismissal of the case as to Pfizer.” CMO No. 60, at 2.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sometimes identified as Pfiser, Inc.

<sup>2</sup> All references to Rules herein are to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

<sup>3</sup> At the request of the parties, the deadline for plaintiffs to file responses to CMO No. 60 was extended to March 31, 2022, and then June 30, 2022. *See* CMO No. 67, at § I.D, ECF No. 747; CMO No. 70, at ¶ B, ECF No. 769. The deadline for Pfizer to oppose each plaintiff’s response was extended to May 15, 2022, then August 16, 2022, and then to October 17, 2022. *See* CMO No. 67, at § I.D, ECF No. 747; CMO No. 70, at ¶ B, ECF No. 769; CMO No. 78, at ¶ A, ECF No. 841.

## II. Legal Standard

Rule 4 governs the requirements regarding serving a summons. In particular, Rule 4(m) requires that “[i]f a defendant is not served 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court – on motion or on its own after notice to plaintiff – must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m). In the Third Circuit, establishing good cause requires a “demonstration of good faith on the part of a party seeking an enlargement and some reasonable basis for noncompliance with the time specified in the rules.” *MCI Telecomms. Corp. v. Teleconcepts, Inc.*, 71 F.3d 1086, 1097 (3d Cir. 1995).<sup>4</sup> In the absence of a showing of good cause for failure timely to effect service, the Court has discretion either to dismiss a case or permit an extension. *Id.* at 1098 (citing *Petrucelli v. Boehringer & Ratzinger*, 46 F.3d 1298, 1305 (3d Cir. 1995)). It is the plaintiff’s burden to demonstrate good cause for such failure to effectuate timely service or to persuade the Court to exercise its discretion and not dismiss Pfizer from their cases. *Spence v. Lahood*, No. 11-3972, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80015, at \*15 (D.N.J. June 8, 2012) (citing *McCurdy v. Am. Bd. of Plastic Surgery*, 157 F.3d 191, 196 (3d Cir. 1998)).

## III. Discussion

As stated above, CMO No. 60 ordered the identified plaintiffs within thirty days to either establish that service was properly effectuated pursuant to Rule 4(m), voluntarily dismiss Pfizer,

---

<sup>4</sup> Plaintiffs note that the version of Rule 4 quoted in *MCI Telecomms* is no longer applicable after an amendment in 1993. The amendment removed “good cause” as an absolute prerequisite for an extension of service. However, as explained above, the good cause standard still exists in Rule 4(m). The amendment merely allows courts, in the absence of good cause, to exercise their discretion to allow an extension if the circumstances warrant. Notably, the Court’s Opinion and Order here is based on the current version of Rule 4(m).

or show cause why Pfizer should not be dismissed. CMO No. 60 did not provide these plaintiffs with an extension of time to serve the Complaint, instead, it directed Plaintiffs to prove that service had in fact been effectuated or to “show cause why Pfizer should not be dismissed.”

The 640 plaintiffs in the cases identified on Exhibit A herein (“Plaintiffs”) have failed to satisfy the requirements of CMO No. 60. Plaintiffs do not claim to have timely served Pfizer and fail to show cause why these cases should proceed despite their lack of compliance with Rule 4(m). *See* CMO No. 7, at § II.D (“Absent agreement of the parties or subsequent Order of the Court, service of process shall be effectuated as required under Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.”). Pfizer did not agree to any modifications to service procedures from those set forth in the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Pfizer did not agree to accept service via e-mail, nor did it agree to receive waivers of service via e-mail. Cf. CMO No. 7, at § II.D, ECF No. 112; CMO No. 27, at § I.D, ECF No. 260; CMO No. 32, ECF No. 396; CMO No. 79, ECF No. 842.

Of the 640 cases at issue here, Plaintiffs and Pfizer agree that Pfizer had not been served at all in 61 of them. In the other 579 cases, Plaintiffs concede that Pfizer was served only after CMO No. 60 was entered. Of the 579 cases where one or both of the parties assert that Pfizer was served after CMO No. 60 (and utilizing the earlier purported date of service in the event that the parties did not agree on the date of service), service was made between one to two years after the ninety-day period in Rule 4(m) in 41 cases; between two to three years after the ninety-day period in 80 cases; and between three to just over four years after the ninety-day period in 458 cases. No Plaintiff here has dismissed Pfizer from their case. Accordingly, due to untimely service and lack of good cause shown, it is appropriate that Pfizer be dismissed from the cases identified in Exhibit A.

**a. Plaintiffs Do Not Demonstrate Good Cause Mandating an Extension of Time to Serve**

Plaintiffs' responses to CMO No. 60 do not demonstrate good cause excusing their lack of timely service pursuant to Rule 4(m). Good cause requires "a demonstration of good faith on the part of the party seeking an enlargement . . . and some reasonable basis for noncompliance with the time specified in the rules." *MCI Telecomms. Corp.*, 71 F.3d at 1097. To determine whether good cause exists, the Court considers "(1) reasonableness of plaintiff's efforts to serve (2) prejudice to the defendant by lack of timely service and (3) whether plaintiff moved for an enlargement of time to serve." *Id.* The primary focus must always be on "the plaintiff's reasons for not complying with the time limit in the first place." *Id.* Yet here, Plaintiffs have not even attempted to show good cause for their failure to timely serve or addressed the reasons for untimeliness. *See, e.g.*, Pl. Allen Pyne's Resp. to Orders to Show Cause Regarding Service of Process, Ex. A, No. 2:18-cv-06938, ECF No. 10-1 ("Pyne Resp."). Accordingly, as the Court further explains, Plaintiffs have failed to demonstrate good cause for failure to timely serve in compliance with Rule 4(m).

As an initial matter, the Court notes that Plaintiffs responded to CMO No. 60 by filing virtually identical responses that do not reference Pfizer's specific conduct. These responses attached an exhibit with limited information about the Plaintiffs' individual cases, but did not include any documentation to support their assertions in the exhibit. The information in these exhibits filed by Plaintiffs includes such information as the date of alleged service (if any), whether a defendant had filed a notice of appearance, whether a defendant had filed a short form answer, whether a Plaintiff Fact Sheet had been uploaded to Marker Group, whether a Defense Fact Sheet had been served, and whether a defendant had sent a deficiency letter related to the Plaintiff Fact Sheet. *See, e.g.*, Pyne Resp.; Nancy Hignite's Resp. to Order to Show Cause Regarding Service of Process, No. 2:18-cv-02649, ECF No. 12 ("Hignite Resp."). In addition, Plaintiffs' briefing does

not address any reasons for the failure to timely serve and instead focuses on arguments concerning Pfizer's purported waiver of service and the Court's authority for discretionary extensions. *See Houser v. Williams*, No. 16-9072, 2020 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 43518, at \*6 (D.N.J. Mar. 12, 2020) (citing *MCI Telecomms. Corp.*, 71 F.3d at 1097) (finding dismissal warranted where plaintiff did not serve the complaint for months after an agreed-upon extension and then failed to detail any steps he took towards serving defendant within the extended time afforded by the court).

Turning to the factors for evaluating good cause, the first factor examines the reasonableness of the plaintiff's efforts to serve the complaint. As noted, Plaintiffs offer no explanation for the failure to timely serve, nor an adequate description of reasonable steps that plaintiffs took to effectuate timely service as required by Rule 4(m). And none of the Plaintiffs at issue here were close to satisfying timely service under Rule 4(m). As previously stated, in 579 cases, service was effected at least one year after the ninety-day period under Rule 4(m) had lapsed; in 458 of the 579 cases, or 79 percent, service was effected over three years after the ninety-day period under Rule 4(m) had lapsed. The 61 Plaintiffs who have never served Pfizer also did not provide any explanation justifying why they have yet to serve Pfizer. Given Plaintiffs' lack of sufficient efforts to serve the complaint, this factor weighs heavily in favor of Pfizer.

Under the second factor, the Court considers prejudice to Pfizer by lack of timely service. Here, Plaintiffs' failure to serve caused Pfizer to expend time and resources through investigation, consultation with opposing counsel, and advocating for and responding to case management orders – all to determine whether Plaintiffs intended to pursue litigation against them. *W. Coasts Quartz Corp. v. M.E.C. Tech, Inc.*, 2017 WL 1944197, at \*2 (D.N.J. May 9, 2017). Moreover, this Court has previously determined that Pfizer has been prejudiced by the delayed service or non-service. *See Order Regarding CMO No. 60*, at 7, ECF No. 887. Given the prejudice to Pfizer resulting

from Plaintiffs' failure to timely serve, this factor cuts against good cause. Even if Plaintiffs had demonstrated lack of prejudice to Pfizer, "absence of prejudice alone can never constitute good cause to excuse late service." *MCI Telecomms Corp.*, 71 F.3d at 1097.

Finally, under the third factor, while Plaintiffs have now requested an extension of time to serve Pfizer, they did so only after CMO No. 60 was entered, which was a year or more after the time to serve Pfizer in compliance with Rule 4(m) had lapsed. *See, e.g.*, Pyne Resp.; Hignite Resp. Plaintiffs have not explained why they did not request an extension of time to serve Pfizer until after CMO No. 60 was entered by this Court. Accordingly, this factor similarly weighs in favor of Pfizer and against Plaintiffs' showing of good cause.

Considering the three factors used to evaluate whether good cause has been demonstrated, Plaintiffs here have not demonstrated good cause for their failure to serve Pfizer in compliance with Rule 4(m).

**b. Plaintiffs Have Not Persuaded the Court That a Discretionary Extension is Warranted**

In the absence of a showing of good cause mandating an extension to effectuate service, the Court nonetheless has discretion to either dismiss the case or permit extension. Because Plaintiffs have not established good cause, *see supra*, they must rely on the Court's discretionary authority to excuse failures to comply with Rule 4(m). *See Edwards v. Hillman*, 849 F. App'x. 23, 25 (3d Cir. 2021) (citing *Petrucelli*, 46 F.3d at 1305). The Court's exercise of discretion in this area is guided by various factors, including: "actual notice of the legal action; prejudice to the defendant; the statute of limitations on the underlying causes of action; the conduct of the defendant; and whether the plaintiff is represented by counsel, in addition to any other factor that may be relevant." *Chiang v. U.S. Small Bus. Admin.*, 331 Fed. App'x 113, 116 (3d Cir. 2009); *see also Spence*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80015, at \*15. Here, considering these factors, Plaintiffs have

not met their burden in persuading the Court that such discretion should be exercised under these circumstances.

With respect to the first factor—actual notice of the legal action—Plaintiffs argue that Pfizer was on notice of their claims through their tolling agreement, which provided Plaintiffs time to obtain information about their claims before filing a complaint.<sup>5</sup> However, the fact that a plaintiff was on the tolling agreement and may potentially bring a claim against Pfizer or another defendant does not mean that Pfizer had actual legal notice that a particular plaintiff would be pursuing his or her claim against Pfizer in a legal action.

*In re Asbestos Prod. Liab. Litig. (No. VI)*, upon which Plaintiffs rely for their argument that a court may extend the time for proper service if the defendant had “actual notice of the pending action,” is instructive. 2014 WL 1903904, at \*1 (E.D. Pa., May 12, 2014); *see* Pyne Resp. at 10 (citing *Asbestos*). The issue there concerned the appropriateness of a specific method of service by mail under Ohio law—not untimely service that occurred anywhere from one to four years past the Rule 4(m) deadline. Notably, the court found that the defendants were on “actual legal notice” of the pending action because the plaintiffs provided proof of a green card signed by the defendant, evidencing receipt of the original process papers by defendants’ counsel, which the court found acceptable under Ohio state law. *Asbestos*, 2014 WL 1903904, at \*1. By contrast, Plaintiffs here have not offered any similar evidence of actual notice. Indeed, as Pfizer argues, the tolling

---

<sup>5</sup> In June 2018, the parties entered into a tolling agreement concerning the statute of limitations. In order to obtain the benefit of tolling under the tolling agreement, a claimant had to provide the following information to all defendants: name and date of birth of the PPI user, name(s) of any derivative claimant(s), city and state of residence, date of first PPI use, date of last PPI use, alleged injury, and name of claimant’s counsel. The Plaintiffs’ Steering Committee was to compile this information and submit it to the defendants on an Excel spreadsheet on a monthly basis. *See* Stip. Regarding Tolling of Stats. of Lim., ECF No. 232, at 1-2. The data required to be provided to all defendants in the tolling agreement did not identify specific defendants whose product(s) were allegedly used by individual plaintiffs.

agreement “covered Plaintiffs who could not yet show proof of use as to a Pfizer product” and, moreover, did not identify a specific defendant or which PPI products were at issue as to a particular potential plaintiff. *See, e.g.*, No. 18-cv-04095, ECF No. 19 at 10 n.3. Therefore, Plaintiffs’ reliance on *Asbestos* is misplaced and they have not demonstrated that Pfizer had actual notice of pending litigation.

Turning to prejudice to the defendant—the second factor—the Court reiterates its analysis when discussing the same factor in the context of good cause. *See supra* III.a (noting Pfizer expended time and resources through its repeated attempts to determine whether Plaintiffs intended to pursue litigation against them, including its own independent inquiries, as well as meetings with counsel and the special master). Further, this Court has previously found in this MDL (with respect to a different defendant) that “[w]asted time and resources and inconvenience standing alone may constitute sufficient prejudice to warrant dismissal.” CMO No. 63 at 7 (citing *Miller v. Advocare, LLC*, No. 12-01069, 2013 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 71451, at \*8-9 (D.N.J. May 21, 2013)). Accordingly, this factor weighs against Plaintiffs’ request.

Regarding the statute of limitations, the third factor, Plaintiffs argue that the applicable statute of limitations in most, if not all, of the actions subject to CMO No. 60 has expired. *See, e.g.*, Pyne Resp. at 21. However, “the expiration of the statute of limitations does not require the court to extend the time for service, as the court has discretion to dismiss the case even if the refiling of the action is barred.” *MCI Telecomms. Corp.*, 71 F.3d at 1098. Given the length of time between filing and service in the cases of these Plaintiffs—in some cases over four years—Plaintiffs’ argument that the potential lapse of the statute of limitations warrants extension is not compelling. Relatedly, Plaintiffs have not alleged that Pfizer engaged in any conduct to impede or

frustrate timely service. *See Spence*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80015, at \*15 (fourth factor). These factors thus militate against a discretionary extension as well.

The final factor guiding the Court’s discretion examines whether the plaintiff is represented by counsel. *See Spence*, 2012 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 80015, at \*15. Plaintiffs here are all represented by counsel. And, in this context, “[e]ven when delay [in service] results from inadvertence of counsel, it need not be excused.” *Petrucelli*, 46 F.3d at 1307. This factor thus also weighs against a discretionary extension.

Weighing all of the above factors, the Court is not persuaded that exercising its discretion to grant an extension to effectuate service on Pfizer is warranted. Moreover, in addition to the factors counseling against an extension, the Court’s conclusion is further supported by Plaintiffs’ failure to provide an explanation as to why they did not timely serve Pfizer (in the 579 cases where service was late) or why they did not serve Pfizer at all (in the remaining 61 cases).<sup>6</sup>

### **c. Plaintiffs Have Not Shown that Pfizer Waived its Defense to Untimely Service**

Plaintiffs generally assert that Pfizer waived any defense related to untimely service by virtue of its conduct in this MDL litigation. Plaintiffs argue that dismissal of their claims against Pfizer is inappropriate in those cases where (1) Pfizer either filed an answer without raising service or answered before service; (2) Pfizer filed a motion to dismiss without raising service; or (3) Pfizer manifested some intention to defend the case through Pfizer’s conduct. *See, e.g.*, Pyne

---

<sup>6</sup> Pfizer also argues that because Plaintiffs did not address their reasons for untimely service (and instead relied chiefly on arguments concerning waiver), Plaintiffs’ reply to CMO 60 failed to comply with a court order, requiring dismissal of their cases on that independent basis. . *See, e.g.*, No. 2:18-cv-04095, ECF No. 19 at 6. Pfizer cites certain *Poulis* factors to support this argument. *Id.* at 10. As explained above, the Court has considered Plaintiffs’ lack of an explanation in its discussion of Rule 4(m) and discretionary extensions.

Respo. at § IV.B; Hignite Resp. at § IV.B. For the below reasons, the Court finds that Pfizer has not waived its defense to untimely service.

The Court first turns to Plaintiffs' argument that Pfizer waived service either by filing an answer without raising service or by answering before service. Plaintiffs assert that, as a general matter, waiver of service may occur where a defendant files an answer as its first responsive pleading and the answer fails to plead the defense. *See, e.g.*, Pyne Resp. at 7. Accordingly, Plaintiffs argue that there are three potential scenarios where service has been waived by answer. First, Plaintiffs claim that in any case where Pfizer filed a short form answer, service was waived because the short form answer simply incorporated Pfizer's initial long form answer. This, Plaintiffs maintain, is because the long form answer did not assert the defense of lack of service. *See, e.g., id.* Second, since a defendant's notice of appearance in a specific case may serve as a short form answer, *see* Case Management Order No. 27 (ECF No. 260), Plaintiffs contend that a notice of appearance after service is functionally the same as a short form answer—it incorporates the long form answer, which does not assert the defense of lack of service. Finally, Plaintiffs argue that a notice of appearance *before* service waives this defense under the terms of Case Management Order No. 27 for cases filed after September 24, 2018. *See, e.g.*, Pyne Resp. at 8; *see also* CMO No. 27, at § I.A.

Regardless of the merits of these arguments as a matter of law, none of these scenarios are applicable to Pfizer here. Only two Plaintiffs in the cases identified in Exhibit A assert that a "Defendant" actually filed an answer or filed a notice of appearance in their case, but the dockets in those two cases clearly reflect that Pfizer did not file an answer or notice of appearance in those two cases. *See* Pl. Sharon Nali's Resp. to Order to Show Cause, Ex. A, 2:18-cv-07667, ECF No. 14-1; Pl. Carol Presley's Resp. to Order to Show Cause, Ex. A, 2:19-cv-16903, ECF No. 6-1. With

these two Plaintiffs' specific assertions contradicted by their dockets, none of the Plaintiffs identified in Exhibit A have shown that Pfizer either filed a short form answer or a notice of appearance. Thus, Plaintiffs' arguments asserting waiver based on Pfizer's answers (or appearances) do not apply here.

Turning to Plaintiffs' next argument, Plaintiffs assert that Pfizer waived its defense to lack of service in those cases where Pfizer filed a motion to dismiss for purported failure to comply with the tolling agreement without specifically raising the defense of service. However, Pfizer did not raise service in its motions to dismiss because an alternate procedure, proposed and agreed upon by the parties, was set forth in a stipulated court order, with their defenses expressly preserved by CMO No. 7. *See* CMO No. 7, ECF No. 112, at 7 ("Defendants also reserve all rights to move to dismiss . . . under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure Rule[] 12. Defendants shall only be permitted to file said motions to dismiss subject to leave of this Court."). CMO No. 7 expressly restricted defendants from moving to dismiss individual plaintiffs under Rule 12 absent leave of this Court. The federal rules bar a defendant from later moving to dismiss for insufficient service of process only when the party "*could have raised* these objections in their [earlier] motion to dismiss the complaint." *Denkins v. William Penn Sch. Dist.*, No. 20-02228, 2020 WL 5880132, at \*3 (E.D. Pa. Oct. 2, 2020); *accord* Wright & Miller, 5C Fed. Prac. & Proc. Civ. § 1391 ("If one or more of these defenses are omitted from the initial motion but were 'then available' to the movant, they are permanently lost."). In filing its authorized dismissal motions pursuant to the tolling agreement and CMO No. 7, Pfizer did not have leave to raise any other defense, including insufficient service as to a particular case. Having understood and agreed that such motions were to be deferred to a later date and with leave of the Court, it is not correct that Pfizer, or any other defendant, waived

its defense of service by failing to argue it in their motions to dismiss related to purported violations of the tolling agreement.

Plaintiffs' final argument on waiver is that Pfizer waived its defense of service through its conduct in the PPI litigation as a whole or in individual cases. As to the argument that Pfizer waived service through its conduct in the PPI litigation as a whole, plaintiffs rely on *In re Cathode Ray Tube (CRT) Antitrust Litigation*, No. 07-5944, 2014 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 78902 (N.D. Cal. June 9, 2014). In that case, certain defendants raised their Rule 12(b)(5) defense to service in a consolidated motion to dismiss, but subsequently abandoned that 12(b)(5) motion in a later filing and then continued to participate in litigation for four years. The court found that under these circumstances those defendants had waived their defense of lack of service. *Id.* at \*84-88. The case is inapposite, however, as Pfizer never previously raised—and abandoned—the defense of service in any of the cases identified here, and indeed was unable to without leave of the Court under CMO No. 7, as agreed to by the parties.

Additionally, Plaintiffs' general response argues that Pfizer waived its defense of service by participating in the litigation of individual cases, citing *In re: Ethicon, Inc.*, No. 2:13-cv-00758, 2016 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 148765 (S.D.W.V. Oct. 27, 2016). In that case, the defendants acknowledged receipt of a plaintiff profile form, requested additional information from the plaintiffs regarding their claims, and threatened to pursue a remedy in court if the plaintiff did not comply with their request. *Id.* at \*6. While eighty-four Plaintiffs herein claim that they received a deficiency letter related to their Plaintiff Fact Sheet, they do not specifically allege whether Pfizer or another defendant sent that deficiency letter, nor did they include a copy of the deficiency letter in their response. Pfizer's counsel has represented that Pfizer did not issue any Plaintiff Fact Sheet deficiency letters to the plaintiffs in the cases identified in Exhibit A hereto and that it has not

threatened to pursue a judicial remedy if the plaintiff did not cure the deficiency. In short, none of these plaintiffs has actually demonstrated that Pfizer has meaningfully participated in the litigation in their particular case. Further, the Court rejects Plaintiffs' suggestion to impute Pfizer's conduct in defending itself in cases not subject to CMO No. 60 to suggest that Pfizer waived its defense of service of process in the specific cases identified in Exhibit A hereto.

Plaintiffs also assert that Pfizer has waited too long to assert its defense of service. Plaintiffs rely on the Sixth Circuit's decision in *King v. Taylor*; however, in that case, unlike here, the defendant actively litigated the case by filing a joint Rule 26(f) report, participating in depositions, seeking to extend discovery deadlines, and joining in a status report in that particular case, and only moved to dismiss for lack of service at the summary judgment stage. *King v. Taylor*, 694 F.3d 650, 659-61 (6<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2012). Here, however, none of the cases identified in Exhibit A is a Bellwether case or a Wave case and thus Pfizer has not participated in discovery in their individual cases like the defendant in *Taylor* did, and as noted previously, stipulated CMO No. 7 precluded Pfizer from filing a motion to dismiss for lack of service without leave of the Court.

#### **IV. Conclusion**

CMO No. 60 required Plaintiffs to (1) show they timely served Pfizer pursuant to Rule 4(m), (2) dismiss Pfizer from their case, or (3) show cause why this Court should not dismiss Pfizer from their cases. Plaintiffs whose cases are on Exhibit A have failed to meet their burden of demonstrating good cause for failure to comply with CMO No. 60 and effectuate timely service, and have failed to persuade the Court to exercise its discretion not to dismiss Pfizer from their

cases. Accordingly, this Court denies Plaintiffs' requests for extensions and orders Pfizer to be dismissed without prejudice from the cases identified in Exhibit A.<sup>7</sup>

Accordingly, **IT IS** on this 24 day of April, 2023;

**ORDERED** that Pfizer shall be **DISMISSED** without prejudice from the cases identified in Exhibit A hereto.

**SO ORDERED.**



---

CLAIRES C. CECCHI, U.S.D.J.

---

<sup>7</sup> To the extent plaintiffs in the cases identified in Exhibit A hereto have raised in their briefing any arguments not expressly addressed herein, the Court has considered and rejected them.

	Plaintiff Name	Case No.
1	Nancy Hignite	2:18-cv-02649
2	James U. Hodges	2:18-cv-02952
3	Ruthe A. Hensley	2:18-cv-03235
4	Antonio D. Davis	2:18-cv-03775
5	Misty Ashley	2:18-cv-03851
6	David Frost	2:18-cv-03861
7	Lester Hall and Ruth E. Hall	2:18-cv-03881
8	Lynda D. McKibben	2:18-cv-03885
9	Leonore L. Sosa	2:18-cv-03886
10	Garrett Sons	2:18-cv-03894
11	Todd K. Andrade	2:18-cv-04040
12	Norman Kydd	2:18-cv-04048
13	Della I. Gregg	2:18-cv-04054
14	Denver Kennett	2:18-cv-04078
15	John Ortiz	2:18-cv-04095
16	Mike Moffat	2:18-cv-04139
17	Laurie T. Lum	2:18-cv-04159
18	Betty L. Sanner	2:18-cv-04169
19	William Ketelsen	2:18-cv-04176
20	Tia Hartmann	2:18-cv-04180
21	Grady Harris	2:18-cv-04181
22	Daniel Sharp	2:18-cv-04184
23	Theresa Johnson	2:18-cv-04206
24	Mary A. Williams	2:18-cv-04208
25	Rayshell Robinson	2:18-cv-04215
26	Deborah Allen	2:18-cv-04281
27	Sharon Acevedo	2:18-cv-04282
28	Patricia Bean	2:18-cv-04283
29	Michael Barrett	2:18-cv-04290
30	Judy K. Aiken	2:18-cv-04291
31	Dale Bryan	2:18-cv-04293
32	Tonya Bates-Wilson	2:18-cv-04296
33	Donna J. Cushenberry	2:18-cv-04298
34	Stella Benefiel	2:18-cv-04304
35	Roosevelt Dunning	2:18-cv-04305
36	Gloria Eddy	2:18-cv-04308
37	Edgardo Biliran	2:18-cv-04309
38	Emma Balthazar	2:18-cv-04312
39	Antionette Borden	2:18-cv-04315
40	Shelley Hager, as Administrator of the Estate of Samuel Hager, Deceased	2:18-cv-04317
41	Anthony Elliott	2:18-cv-04318
42	Kevin Casey	2:18-cv-04319
43	George Curry	2:18-cv-04326
44	Deloris Daniel	2:18-cv-04330
45	Ricky Fisher	2:18-cv-04332

46	David D. Hopkins	2:18-cv-04350
47	Dennis Ledford and Tracey Ledford	2:18-cv-04477
48	Rozell Collins	2:18-cv-04482
49	Cassandra Howard	2:18-cv-04484
50	Patricia Cooper	2:18-cv-04491
51	Leray Littell	2:18-cv-04492
52	Tony Long	2:18-cv-04495
53	Sandra Davis	2:18-cv-04496
54	Robert Parham, Jr.	2:18-cv-04497
55	Climmie Gibbons	2:18-cv-04499
56	Teresa Harlen, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Jack R. Harlen, Deceased	2:18-cv-04500
57	Vivian Parker	2:18-cv-04501
58	Heather P. Lott	2:18-cv-04502
59	Virginia Rackins	2:18-cv-04504
60	Otis D. Roberts	2:18-cv-04507
61	Robert Ludlam, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Aubie Ludlam, Deceased	2:18-cv-04511
62	Jessie Martin	2:18-cv-04519
63	Mary Hankamer	2:18-cv-04520
64	Brenda R. Dale	2:18-cv-04526
65	Kelly Smith	2:18-cv-04529
66	Mary Haynes	2:18-cv-04535
67	Betty Head	2:18-cv-04538
68	Jerome Browning	2:18-cv-04827
69	Clarence Mumma	2:18-cv-04828
70	Beverly Bryant	2:18-cv-04829
71	Jose Fronda	2:18-cv-04830
72	Rolanda Allmon	2:18-cv-04831
73	Constance Guardado	2:18-cv-04833
74	Steve Slade	2:18-cv-04843
75	Donell Andrews	2:18-cv-04852
76	Joyce Watson	2:18-cv-04864
77	Jeanette Williams	2:18-cv-04868
78	Avis Hiestand	2:18-cv-04871
79	Roger Mata	2:18-cv-04872
80	Linda Bishop	2:18-cv-04873
81	Darlene Mason	2:18-cv-04874
82	Laura Raffa	2:18-cv-04877
83	Scott Allen	2:18-cv-04882
84	Max Holbrook and Joyce Holbrook	2:18-cv-04888
85	Mildred Brock	2:18-cv-04904
86	Unni Shelton	2:18-cv-04915
87	Darwin Watson	2:18-cv-04918
88	Terry Debruyn	2:18-cv-04921
89	John M. Sierra	2:18-cv-04923
90	Woodie G. Murphy	2:18-cv-04933

91	Oscar M. Chavez	2:18-cv-04936
92	Priscilla Smeets	2:18-cv-04938
93	Paula Ford	2:18-cv-04943
94	Joseph Spurgeon and Sambra Spurgeon	2:18-cv-04948
95	Roger Phillips	2:18-cv-05034
96	Billie Martin Stinson	2:18-cv-05038
97	Wanda Thomas	2:18-cv-05040
98	Lorenzo Valenzuela	2:18-cv-05055
99	Brenda Jo Lemley	2:18-cv-05060
100	Helen Waddle	2:18-cv-05061
101	Rodrick Whitaker	2:18-cv-05068
102	Dawn Miller	2:18-cv-05069
103	Robert Dryden	2:18-cv-05081
104	Charla Mogg	2:18-cv-05084
105	Maudell Palmer	2:18-cv-05306
106	Fred L. Johns	2:18-cv-05314
107	Danielle Newman, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Jack F. Newman, Deceased	2:18-cv-05324
108	Peggy S. Conley	2:18-cv-05343
109	Dwight W. Graley, Sr.	2:18-cv-05345
110	Scott Hannigan	2:18-cv-05351
111	Birdie D. Jackson	2:18-cv-05353
112	Rebecca M Oates	2:18-cv-05360
113	David Pierce	2:18-cv-05361
114	Teresa Byers	2:18-cv-05431
115	Donald Gibson	2:18-cv-05438
116	Michael Clarke and Maribeth Clarke	2:18-cv-05448
117	Sandra Garrett	2:18-cv-05463
118	Nancy L. Harsh	2:18-cv-05466
119	Bryan G. Swanson	2:18-cv-05476
120	Melvin Stubbs	2:18-cv-05479
121	Jennifer Wolfe	2:18-cv-05485
122	Sharon Powers	2:18-cv-05488
123	Arthur D. Warshawsky	2:18-cv-05490
124	Martha Burns	2:18-cv-05495
125	Kyle Rose	2:18-cv-05500
126	Jeffrey Jones	2:18-cv-05504
127	Burma G. Sizemore	2:18-cv-05511
128	Carmen Stevens	2:18-cv-05516
129	Shirley Teel, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Ezra C. Teel, Deceased	2:18-cv-05521
130	James Wellman	2:18-cv-05525
131	Dara Dougherty	2:18-cv-05954
132	Sheryl Gerald	2:18-cv-05959
133	Samantha Riddle	2:18-cv-05971
134	Gwenda Steele	2:18-cv-05975

135	Barbara Gibson, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Alta Gibson, Deceased	2:18-cv-05976
136	George Hawkins	2:18-cv-05980
137	Willie Anderson	2:18-cv-06130
138	Mary Hollander	2:18-cv-06148
139	Lance Faulkner	2:18-cv-06154
140	Jeffrey Reed	2:18-cv-06159
141	Sharon Reid	2:18-cv-06164
142	Bartholomew Gaiera and Karen Gaiera	2:18-cv-06166
143	Kathlene Brown	2:18-cv-06171
144	Joni Barrows	2:18-cv-06178
145	Rebecca Harrington	2:18-cv-06196
146	Patricia Hasty	2:18-cv-06202
147	Richard Jackson and Judy Fontenot	2:18-cv-06214
148	Bonnie L. Mize	2:18-cv-06232
149	Jackie Knight	2:18-cv-06233
150	Tunya Lowe	2:18-cv-06256
151	Patina Johnson	2:18-cv-06274
152	Cristy Blankenship	2:18-cv-06436
153	Johnny Daniels	2:18-cv-06440
154	Emilee Palmer and Michael D. Palmer	2:18-cv-06449
155	Travis Charlton, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Cynthia Halbert, Deceased	2:18-cv-06476
156	Nina Fernandez, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Sandra Nobil, Deceased	2:18-cv-06497
157	Elizabeth Prater	2:18-cv-06506
158	Jerry Blosser, Individually and as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Wanda Blosser, Deceased	2:18-cv-06515
159	Norma Stillwagoner	2:18-cv-06520
160	Karen Keenan, Individually and as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Larry Keenan, Deceased	2:18-cv-06522
161	Gina Zerby, Individually and as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Michael Zerby, Deceased	2:18-cv-06532
162	Michelle Wilson	2:18-cv-06540
163	Emilly Knotts, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Cheryl Stefenel, Deceased	2:18-cv-06552
164	Jacquelyn Booker	2:18-cv-06834
165	Dianne Caldwell	2:18-cv-06846
166	Leona Collins, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Deniese Collins, Deceased	2:18-cv-06869
167	Patrick Connors	2:18-cv-06876
168	Allen Pyne	2:18-cv-06938
169	Gladys Maddox	2:18-cv-06939
170	Johnnie Oliver	2:18-cv-06947
171	Betty Bassett, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Robert Avera, Deceased	2:18-cv-06949

172	Charles Jones, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Victoria Jones, deceased	2:18-cv-06952
173	Danny Parker	2:18-cv-06964
174	Patricia Parker	2:18-cv-06975
175	Charles Howard	2:18-cv-06986
176	Teresa Hill-Ibrahim	2:18-cv-07005
177	Judy Bradshaw, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Jimmy Bradshaw, Deceased	2:18-cv-07049
178	Victor Sackett	2:18-cv-07059
179	Virginia Boyd	2:18-cv-07090
180	Herbert Johnson	2:18-cv-07130
181	Joan Stoveken, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Gay Stoveken, Deceased	2:18-cv-07137
182	Angela Spicer, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of James Spicer, Deceased	2:18-cv-07148
183	Amanda Turner, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Ronal Turner, Deceased	2:18-cv-07153
184	Jeanette Mouton	2:18-cv-07178
185	Erick Barnes	2:18-cv-07187
186	Tammy Perry	2:18-cv-07194
187	Wendy Brazill	2:18-cv-07195
188	Brenda Fletcher	2:18-cv-07203
189	Nancy Esque	2:18-cv-07208
190	Diane McGee, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Kevin McGee, Deceased	2:18-cv-07239
191	George Gale	2:18-cv-07267
192	Fabian Garcia, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Yolanda Montalvo, Deceased	2:18-cv-07276
193	Joann Flowers, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Sophia Perkins, Deceased	2:18-cv-07320
194	Thomas Russo	2:18-cv-07340
195	Paul Lue, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Hyacinth Johnson, Deceased	2:18-cv-07352
196	Ernestine Mays-Mitchell, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Ernest Mays, Deceased	2:18-cv-07365
197	Birdie Woods	2:18-cv-07438
198	Betty Apellido	2:18-cv-07557
199	Pauline Corn	2:18-cv-07584
200	Gloria Dietrich	2:18-cv-07592
201	Walker Howell	2:18-cv-07616
202	Stephanie Ralston-Bailey	2:18-cv-07617
203	Laura Richie	2:18-cv-07622
204	Regina Salisbury	2:18-cv-07632
205	Mary Skeens	2:18-cv-07637
206	Marlene Hatfield	2:18-cv-07639
207	Sharon Nali	2:18-cv-07667

208	William Solis, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Aura Burgos, Deceased	2:18-cv-07688
209	Ronald Klinenberg	2:18-cv-07706
210	Luis Nesta	2:18-cv-07708
211	Lorraine Turco	2:18-cv-07713
212	Hazel Phillips	2:18-cv-07748
213	Tracie Powers	2:18-cv-07756
214	Mary Rivali, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Robert Rivali, Deceased	2:18-cv-07760
215	Marilyn Sullivan, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Evelyn Sullivan, Deceased	2:18-cv-07781
216	Bernadine Hardie	2:18-cv-07795
217	Maribel Villanueva, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Alexander Rivera-Baez, Deceased	2:18-cv-07799
218	Karen Vassar, Representative of the Estate of Bobby Vassar, Deceased	2:18-cv-08722
219	Odilia Perez	2:19-cv-01061
220	Dennis Quintin	2:19-cv-01813
221	Martha Griffith	2:19-cv-01853
222	William Hall	2:19-cv-01859
223	Brenda Willis, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Seress Harris, Deceased	2:19-cv-01873
224	Gloria Haywood	2:19-cv-01881
225	Ruth Hurd	2:19-cv-01887
226	Eric Hurwitz	2:19-cv-01889
227	Patricia Joppien	2:19-cv-01897
228	Paul Jozwiak	2:19-cv-01902
229	George Bonis	2:19-cv-01931
230	Raymond Bryant	2:19-cv-01939
231	John Bottoms	2:19-cv-01945
232	Cindy Campbell	2:19-cv-01948
233	Colleen Cantwell	2:19-cv-01965
234	Gladys Carpenter	2:19-cv-01981
235	Brandon Cole	2:19-cv-02004
236	Robert Crenshaw	2:19-cv-02011
237	Wanda Crager	2:19-cv-02012
238	Jason Daniels	2:19-cv-02015
239	Luis Manuel Delgado, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Luis C. Delgado, Deceased	2:19-cv-02030
240	Linda McMillen	2:19-cv-02035
241	Odessa Mitchell	2:19-cv-02040
242	Patricia Mitchell	2:19-cv-02048
243	Charles Newsom	2:19-cv-02050
244	Orestes Diaz	2:19-cv-02059
245	Helmut Otto	2:19-cv-02061
246	Darryl Oglesby, as Proposed Administrator of the Estate of Sandra Oglesby, Deceased	2:19-cv-02066

247	Charlotte Edgar	2:19-cv-02074
248	Carey Bowie, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Henry Bowie, Deceased	2:19-cv-02086
249	Maria Edwards, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Francisca Camacho, Deceased	2:19-cv-02092
250	Warren Ketchmore	2:19-cv-02102
251	Juan Cantu, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Margarita Cantu, Deceased	2:19-cv-02104
252	Juanita Landers	2:19-cv-02127
253	Karen Gaines	2:19-cv-02136
254	Brenda McCurdy, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Rickey McCurdy, Deceased	2:19-cv-02143
255	Bridgette Long	2:19-cv-02159
256	Nettie Overton, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Charlie Overton, Deceased	2:19-cv-02174
257	Glenda Long	2:19-cv-02175
258	Melissa Olson	2:19-cv-02204
259	Raymond Wilson, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Randy Orr, Deceased	2:19-cv-02239
260	Sandra Pannell	2:19-cv-02246
261	Priscille Parent	2:19-cv-02261
262	Lucretia Peavy	2:19-cv-02275
263	Mabel Perry	2:19-cv-02318
264	Glenna Pool	2:19-cv-02335
265	Debra Primrose	2:19-cv-02356
266	Margaret Pryor, As the Representative of the Estate of Keith Pryor, Deceased	2:19-cv-02367
267	Joyce Sheffield	2:19-cv-02377
268	Terry Sheffield	2:19-cv-02386
269	Carl Warner	2:19-cv-02456
270	Lionel Smith	2:19-cv-02464
271	Sherrie Abrahamson	2:19-cv-02469
272	Linda Stockwell	2:19-cv-02475
273	Diane Watkins	2:19-cv-02484
274	James Williams	2:19-cv-02487
275	Charles Wiley	2:19-cv-02493
276	Belinda Beck, Individually and as the Administrator of the Estate of Willie Taylor, Deceased	2:19-cv-02519
277	Nathan Tyler	2:19-cv-02523
278	Vivian Wittner, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Myra Wittner, Deceased	2:19-cv-02531
279	Darwin Valentine	2:19-cv-02547
280	Susan Lynn Wright, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Tabitha Wright, Deceased	2:19-cv-02577
281	Donna Wooten	2:19-cv-02586
282	Sharon Grady, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Herbert Grady, Deceased	2:19-cv-02669

283	Judy K. Freed	2:19-cv-02687
284	Connie Black	2:19-cv-02703
285	Laurie J Dey	2:19-cv-02873
286	Esmeralda Olvera, As proposed Representative of the Estate of Santos Olvera, deceased	2:19-CV-02877
287	Ernest J Palmer	2:19-cv-02882
288	Cheryl Adams, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Belle Collins, Deceased	2:19-cv-02996
289	Angela Clark	2:19-cv-03070
290	George Reyes	2:19-cv-03081
291	Joe A. Gottwald	2:19-cv-03115
292	Matt Spasoff	2:19-cv-03117
293	Nancy Fennell	2:19-cv-03132
294	Merle Kirkland	2:19-cv-03272
295	Sheila Holmes	2:19-cv-03327
296	Brenda Y. Ridolph	2:19-cv-03419
297	Cynthia Tucker	2:19-cv-03489
298	Rosetta T. Cunningham	2:19-cv-03553
299	Michelle Denofa, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Frank Denofa, Deceased	2:19-cv-03571
300	Paul E. Dilocker	2:19-cv-03589
301	Ruth Edwards	2:19-cv-03595
302	Phillip Cottle	2:19-cv-03618
303	Jannie Gichia	2:19-cv-03625
304	Diana Greathouse	2:19-cv-03633
305	Lena Turknett, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Cecilia Gaines, Deceased	2:19-cv-03636
306	Suzanne Coleman-Cunningham	2:19-cv-03638
307	Betty Hunter, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Thomas Hunter, Deceased	2:19-cv-03645
308	Noreen Davis-Xanthis	2:19-cv-03646
309	Juanita Mekwuye	2:19-cv-03652
310	Carla A. Dimatteo	2:19-cv-03658
311	Barbara Zajack	2:19-cv-03663
312	Jennifer Collins	2:19-cv-03679
313	Melissa Harris	2:19-cv-03684
314	Tracy Henderson	2:19-cv-03685
315	Linwood Flemister	2:19-cv-03686
316	James W. Franklin, Sr.	2:19-cv-03711
317	Keisha Kimbrough	2:19-cv-03723
318	Cynthia Lawhorn	2:19-cv-03739
319	Lynell Johnson	2:19-cv-03784
320	Michael Anthony Jones	2:19-cv-03806
321	Cara Kreider	2:19-cv-03817
322	Stephen C. McNeill	2:19-cv-03823
323	Michael DePhillipo, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Felice DePhillipo, Deceased	2:19-cv-03858

324	Tammy R. Phipps	2:19-cv-03863
325	Melissa Konarski, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Pamela Zaccardi, Deceased	2:19-cv-03869
326	Kevin M. Takacs	2:19-cv-03921
327	Anna B. Franks	2:19-cv-03984
328	Brandon R. Ward	2:19-cv-03987
329	Raymond A. Watson	2:19-cv-04002
330	Darren Williams	2:19-cv-04012
331	Belinda L. Laird	2:19-cv-04031
332	Anita Loudy	2:19-cv-04113
333	Sandra Detherage	2:19-cv-04133
334	Carol Rosenblum	2:19-cv-04146
335	Linda Barnett	2:19-cv-04152
336	Keith Ellery	2:19-cv-04166
337	Kerry Bland	2:19-cv-04178
338	Denise Garrette	2:19-cv-04188
339	Josette Schaffer	2:19-cv-04192
340	John Danso, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Vickie Danso, Deceased	2:19-cv-04204
341	Lawrence Lucerne	2:19-cv-04209
342	Sandra Mason	2:19-cv-04218
343	Beverly McCaleb	2:19-cv-04224
344	Karen E. Rawlings	2:19-cv-04226
345	Veda McDonald-Rhodes, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Andre McDonald, Deceased	2:19-cv-04228
346	Joanne Smith	2:19-cv-04234
347	Diane Wood	2:19-cv-04242
348	Terry L. Tharp	2:19-cv-04250
349	Donald Torgerson	2:19-cv-04254
350	Mary Burchett	2:19-cv-04470
351	Michael Bowen	2:19-cv-04503
352	Curtis Banks, Jr.	2:19-cv-04514
353	Catherine Antwine	2:19-cv-04516
354	Jackie L. Brown	2:19-cv-04518
355	Joseph A. Archer	2:19-cv-04519
356	Margie T. Bannister	2:19-cv-04528
357	Leta Bannon	2:19-cv-04535
358	Janice Weibley, on behalf of Elizabeth L. Boyd	2:19-cv-04537
359	Richard Bailey	2:19-cv-04559
360	Debra Bramblett	2:19-cv-04561
361	Brent Bregan	2:19-cv-04574
362	Renee E. Adkins	2:19-cv-04623
363	Damisha L. Bishop	2:19-cv-04684
364	Joe Alfieri	2:19-cv-04690
365	Shirley Bass	2:19-cv-04703
366	Alice Baxter	2:19-cv-04722

367	Anna Gonzalez, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Beatrice Ceja, Deceased	2:19-cv-04750
368	Twila M. Dillon	2:19-cv-04790
369	Dora Chatman	2:19-cv-04826
370	David A. Ealy	2:19-cv-04837
371	Albert G. Collins	2:19-cv-04853
372	Nelda Dugas	2:19-cv-04861
373	James Drain	2:19-cv-04863
374	Tina Dasher	2:19-cv-04882
375	Augusta L. Colson	2:19-cv-04909
376	John Elliott	2:19-cv-04913
377	David Andrews	2:19-cv-04914
378	Adela Anguiano	2:19-cv-04927
379	Troy Ersch	2:19-cv-04932
380	Ronald R. Francis	2:19-cv-04975
381	Angela Clinton	2:19-cv-04981
382	Robin Fizhugh	2:19-cv-05006
383	Mary Duncan	2:19-cv-05072
384	Charlotte Edwards	2:19-cv-05097
385	Matilda Gagliardi	2:19-cv-05119
386	Barbara S. Foutty	2:19-cv-05132
387	Angela K. Henry	2:19-cv-05185
388	Bobby G Jones	2:19-cv-05196
389	Darlene Huettenberger	2:19-cv-05197
390	Gary D. Johnson	2:19-cv-05199
391	Helen Humphrey	2:19-cv-05243
392	Ronnie W. Johnson	2:19-cv-05247
393	Donna Hines	2:19-cv-05275
394	Denice M Justice	2:19-cv-05307
395	Connie Ivory	2:19-cv-05324
396	Constance Gary	2:19-cv-05335
397	Barton S. Hickey	2:19-cv-05353
398	Marne Gonzales	2:19-cv-05355
399	Pamela Kazak	2:19-cv-05369
400	Phyllis J. Kinsey	2:19-cv-05376
401	Steven Graham	2:19-cv-05547
402	June S. Grumbein	2:19-cv-05558
403	Alcadio Guajardo, III	2:19-cv-05583
404	Theresa R. Grove	2:19-cv-05606
405	Darren Gines	2:19-cv-05608
406	Connie Gamez	2:19-cv-05652
407	Paul Glasper	2:19-cv-05699
408	Doris Harder	2:19-cv-05791
409	Rashidah Id-Deen	2:19-cv-05805
410	Bonnie Holtgrew	2:19-cv-05814
411	Jeffrey A Heaps	2:19-cv-05853
412	Terica Lemon	2:19-cv-06014

413	Gail H. Mills	2:19-cv-06072
414	Lisa Mitchell	2:19-cv-06080
415	Berchia M. Mitchell	2:19-cv-06106
416	Jason R. Mitchell	2:19-cv-06110
417	Anna Hoppes	2:19-cv-06157
418	Carson E. Wingo	2:19-cv-06224
419	Joe N. Little	2:19-cv-06225
420	Betty J. Withrow	2:19-cv-06226
421	Annette London	2:19-cv-06231
422	Penny E Wolfe	2:19-cv-06237
423	Melissa Lonsdale	2:19-cv-06246
424	Richard A. Lovelace	2:19-cv-06320
425	Desiree Lovins	2:19-cv-06323
426	Betty Lowther	2:19-cv-06374
427	Joseph W. Lucas	2:19-cv-06376
428	Martin Masar Jr.	2:19-cv-06432
429	James Mason	2:19-cv-06444
430	Lynda Mercer	2:19-cv-06456
431	Lena Woolfolk	2:19-cv-06457
432	Arlene Miller	2:19-cv-06496
433	Thelma McClellen	2:19-cv-06520
434	Brenda McConnachie	2:19-cv-06522
435	Grachell L. Manuel	2:19-cv-06537
436	Uri Moscovici	2:19-cv-06541
437	Marilyn Young	2:19-cv-06599
438	Terry Hays-Booker	2:19-cv-06613
439	Missouri McCann	2:19-cv-06614
440	Marybelle J. Nohejl and Donald Nohejl	2:19-cv-06648
441	Colton Norwood	2:19-cv-06653
442	Norma J. Ochoa	2:19-cv-06657
443	Herschel Overby	2:19-cv-06681
444	Sherrie Owerko	2:19-cv-06685
445	Deborah L. Patterson	2:19-cv-06706
446	Shirley Murray	2:19-cv-06713
447	David Peterson, Sr.	2:19-cv-06827
448	Leonard Nesbitt	2:19-cv-06828
449	Alvin Williamson	2:19-cv-06848
450	David O. Pinto	2:19-cv-06874
451	Andrew E. Polly	2:19-cv-06890
452	Emily Nichols	2:19-cv-06894
453	Joyce Niemi	2:19-cv-06899
454	Norma Wright	2:19-cv-06918
455	Misty C. Powell	2:19-cv-06966
456	Leon Rhodes and Veronica Rhodes	2:19-cv-06967
457	Linda Roach	2:19-cv-07057
458	Sharon Raabe	2:19-cv-07069
459	Martha Bruton	2:19-cv-07076

460	Brian Rose	2:19-cv-07133
461	Brandi Peebles	2:19-cv-07166
462	William Schiffert	2:19-cv-07203
463	Darlet A. Simile	2:19-cv-07208
464	Ben Schwartz	2:19-cv-07238
465	Robert Smith	2:19-cv-07247
466	Rita Scott, As Proposed Representative of the Estate of Melvern Scott, Deceased	2:19-cv-07250
467	Roberta Ruddy	2:19-cv-07297
468	Scott E. Shaner	2:19-cv-07348
469	Amos Smith	2:19-cv-07350
470	Anita L. Shank	2:19-cv-07352
471	Sharon Smith	2:19-cv-07389
472	Valorie Sherrod	2:19-cv-07390
473	Annette H. Shook	2:19-cv-07400
474	Ysleta Smith	2:19-cv-07403
475	Arlene Sidenstick	2:19-cv-07425
476	Heidi McGee	2:19-cv-07516
477	Laronda M. McMurray	2:19-cv-07540
478	Shanda M. Meacacke	2:19-cv-07543
479	Brenda Swift	2:19-cv-07558
480	Dawn Takacs	2:19-cv-07560
481	Ruby M. Terrasas	2:19-cv-07589
482	Pamela D. Terry	2:19-cv-07590
483	Ruth Thompson	2:19-cv-07605
484	Cheryl Russell	2:19-cv-07635
485	Courtney Stark	2:19-cv-07636
486	Sally D. Reed	2:19-cv-07642
487	Sandra Steen	2:19-cv-07658
488	Sonja F. Anthony	2:19-cv-07681
489	Nadine Reese	2:19-cv-07732
490	Tammy Sateriale	2:19-cv-07793
491	Arnoldo Sauceda	2:19-cv-07799
492	Rodney Stewart	2:19-cv-07800
493	Nicholas Savini	2:19-cv-07825
494	Joan v. Streek	2:19-cv-07857
495	Emma L. White	2:19-cv-07869
496	Susan Reitz	2:19-cv-07879
497	Kevin Wiggs	2:19-cv-07893
498	Robert W. Tonini	2:19-cv-07908
499	Carmen Vitello	2:19-cv-08007
500	Brenda J. Wadman	2:19-cv-08050
501	Jami Butler, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of David Ayers, Deceased	2:19-cv-08067
502	Bonnie S. Walburn	2:19-cv-08097
503	Dianne C. Walker	2:19-cv-08137
504	Darlene Watson	2:19-cv-08319

505	Cherry Watson	2:19-cv-08323
506	Corderro Watts	2:19-cv-08325
507	Wayne Price	2:19-cv-08421
508	Daniel E. Varner	2:19-cv-08449
509	Audrey M. Werner	2:19-cv-08547
510	Joseph White Sr.	2:19-cv-08573
511	Robert Acosta	2:19-cv-08709
512	Wilma Bibbs	2:19-cv-10048
513	Shirley Brantley	2:19-cv-10050
514	Esther Garza, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Jorge Garza, Deceased	2:19-cv-10059
515	James Goff	2:19-cv-10060
516	Regla Hernandez	2:19-cv-10064
517	Elizabeth Hoover, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Katharina Hoover, Deceased	2:19-cv-10069
518	Barbara Jensen	2:19-cv-10072
519	Lorenzo Limon	2:19-cv-10079
520	Andrew Mae Martin	2:19-cv-10083
521	Delaine Moore	2:19-cv-10087
522	Allawana Parsons, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Smith Parsons, Deceased	2:19-cv-10088
523	Lydia Robinson	2:19-cv-10092
524	Felicta Santos	2:19-cv-10094
525	Margaret Chappel, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Adrian Smith, Deceased	2:19-cv-10102
526	Ernestine Thompson	2:19-cv-10115
527	Rosa Vega	2:19-cv-10129
528	Katie Ware	2:19-cv-10141
529	Barbara Wargo	2:19-cv-10142
530	Billy Wiginton	2:19-cv-10143
531	Scott Wright	2:19-cv-10145
532	Brenda Wyatt	2:19-cv-10146
533	Sheila Cuffee, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Corinne Blackwell, Deceased	2:19-cv-10147
534	Terri Bullock Dortmundt	2:19-cv-10715
535	Elisa Puentes, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Lucy Hernandez, Deceased	2:19-cv-11000
536	Kimberly Ann Tomajko	2:19-cv-11010
537	Billie Whitehead, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Artis Whitehead, Deceased	2:19-cv-11013
538	Judy Edwards	2:19-cv-11320
539	Kevin Hickles, Sr.	2:19-cv-11329
540	George D. Pulford	2:19-cv-11375
541	Roxanne Robertson	2:19-cv-11575
542	Julia K. Strickland	2:19-cv-11582
543	Sharon L. Thorne	2:19-cv-11585
544	Dian F. Umbaugh	2:19-cv-11590

545	Josephine Cumbo	2:19-cv-11776
546	Terri McCrea, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Franklin D. McCrea, Sr.	2:19-cv-11857
547	Nina Rosemond	2:19-cv-11862
548	Temika Smith	2:19-cv-11866
549	Lucy M. Spinner	2:19-cv-11888
550	Doris Bowens	2:19-cv-13354
551	Raymond Brisson	2:19-cv-13490
552	Earnest Thomas	2:19-cv-13491
553	Gregory Lomax	2:19-cv-13677
554	Arthurette Watford	2:19-cv-13678
555	Thomas Bradd	2:19-cv-14061
556	Davida Linn-Cammarano, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Frank Cammarano, Deceased	2:19-cv-14064
557	Marilyn Padgett, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Novalynn Collins, Deceased	2:19-cv-14065
558	Paul Cyrus	2:19-cv-14066
559	Joshua Cole	2:19-cv-14513
560	Karen King	2:19-cv-14732
561	Louis Brown, Jr., Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Irene Brown, Deceased	2:19-cv-15341
562	Louis Brown, Jr., Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Lewis Brown, Sr., Deceased	2:19-cv-15342
563	Jeffrey Taylor	2:19-cv-15345
564	Eddie Felder	2:19-cv-15445
565	Karen Wells, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Michael Wells, Deceased	2:19-cv-15570
566	Larry Moore	2:19-cv-15571
567	Paul Greer	2:19-cv-15777
568	Mark Marcello	2:19-cv-15881
569	Marilyn Pritchard	2:19-cv-16196
570	Carol Presley	2:19-cv-16903
571	Danny Garabedian	2:19-cv-16905
572	Robert McCray	2:19-cv-17096
573	Jack Schonenberger	2:19-cv-17541
574	Victor Rodriguez, Individually and as the Representative of the Estate of Susan Rodriguez, Deceased	2:19-cv-17658
575	Stephen Marchut	2:19-cv-17991
576	Richard Elstun	2:19-cv-18108
577	Karen Arndt	2:19-cv-18304
578	Shirley Howard	2:19-cv-19780
579	Robin Noblin	2:19-cv-19781
580	James Cadieux	2:19-cv-21720
581	Brandy Ramirez	2:19-cv-21958
582	Mary Medeiros	2:19-cv-21962
583	Lynetta J. Hollingworth	2:19-cv-22041

584	Alonia Williams, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of I.G. Thompson, Sr., Deceased	2:19-cv-22153
585	Weldon Paul Steadman, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Phyllis Steadman, Deceased	2:19-cv-22221
586	Jonathan E Beckham	2:20-cv-00979
587	Kimberly J Burrows	2:20-cv-00984
588	Kenneth B. Cousette	2:20-cv-00986
589	Edward L. Thomas	2:20-cv-01015
590	Stephen Deloney	2:20-cv-01028
591	Kathreen Hensley	2:20-cv-01523
592	Brenda Williams, Individually and as PR of the Estate of Alvin Williams	2:20-cv-01844
593	Sterling Binns	2:20-cv-02070
594	Martha Jones	2:20-cv-03162
595	Ernest Nelson Jr.	2:20-cv-03422
596	Pasquale A Palange	2:20-cv-04531
597	Elena Patrizio	2:20-cv-04539
598	Dorothy R Lewis	2:20-cv-04636
599	Barbara Minchew	2:20-cv-04644
600	Rebecca Ann Gordon	2:20-cv-04667
601	Janice C. Rodgers	2:20-cv-04740
602	Gary Friend	2:20-cv-04760
603	Charles F Duke	2:20-cv-04792
604	Linda B Ross	2:20-cv-04811
605	Cheryl K Strouse	2:20-cv-04829
606	Glenda Weeks	2:20-cv-04841
607	Sherry White, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Raymond White, Deceased	2:20-cv-04844
608	Jacqueline Williams	2:20-cv-04846
609	Mary Zangara	2:20-cv-04850
610	William Clinton	2:20-cv-04884
611	Robert Shawn Trybala	2:20-cv-04923
612	Jane Cedar	2:20-cv-04940
613	Alma J. Williams	2:20-cv-04956
614	Jennefer Prepelica	2:20-cv-04957
615	John E. Pumphrey, Jr.	2:20-cv-04962
616	Sue Brewer	2:20-cv-05029
617	Joan C. Harper	2:20-cv-05040
618	Ella Norman	2:20-cv-05052
619	Susan M. Pierce	2:20-cv-05066
620	Hyram Archdale, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Kathleen K. Price, Deceased	2:20-cv-05070
621	Christopher Ritenour	2:20-cv-05077
622	Laura J Sutphin	2:20-cv-05079
623	Quintina N. Wright	2:20-cv-05088
624	James Ziegler	2:20-cv-05092
625	Marie Stacey	2:20-cv-05244

626	Robert Keenan, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Douglas W. Keenan, Deceased	2:20-cv-05266
627	Karen Boyer	2:20-cv-05327
628	William Broyles, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Mary J. Broyles, Deceased	2:20-cv-05329
629	Renee McPheeters, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Mary Lou Christopher, Deceased	2:20-cv-05343
630	Linda Donaldson	2:20-cv-05344
631	Barbara Dryer	2:20-cv-05345
632	Eva M Longino	2:20-cv-05354
633	Debra Mitchell, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Dennis M. Mitchell, Deceased	2:20-cv-05360
634	Vonda Smith, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Thomas D. Smith, Deceased	2:20-cv-05368
635	John Johnson	2:20-cv-05380
636	Sharon D. Lee	2:20-cv-06715
637	Victor Culpepper, as Proposed Representative of the Estate of Lisa Culpepper, Deceased	2:20-cv-06986
638	Brenda Kellam	2:20-cv-07294
639	Sandra Loesche	2:20-cv-07344
640	Alex Montiel	2:20-cv-07345